



IFW

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 04208.0197-00

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
)	
Masaru SATO et al.)	Species Art Unit: 2833
)	
Application No. 10/735,882)	Examiner: HAMMOND, B.R.
)	
Filed: December 16, 2003)	
)	
For: SOCKET FOR)	Confirmation No. 5477
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE)	
)	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Sir:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In a restriction requirement dated February 4, 2005, the Examiner required restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 between *Species I (Figs 1-18), Species II (Figs. 18-19B), *Species III (Figs. 20A-23), *Species IV (Figs. 24A-27), Species V (Figs. 28-30), *Species VI (Figs. 31A-34), Species VII (Figs. 35-40), *Species VIII (Figs. 41A-43), Species IX (Figs. 44A-46, 48 and 49), Species X (Figs. 50-52), *Species XI (Figs. 53-58, 60-61B), Species XII (Fig. 59), and Species XIII (Figs. 62A-64). For the species indicated with an asterisk (*), the Examiner required a further election of species for the plurality of sockets and/or the pressing member.

It is Applicants understanding that the Examiner is requiring a further election for species having an asterisk between embodiments having one socket and embodiments showing multiple sockets. To the extent Applicants' understanding of the election of species requirement is incorrect, Applicants reserve the right to change the election of species.

Applicants respectfully traverse the election of species requirement. However, to be fully responsive to the requirements, Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute Species I, Figs. 7-17, and claims 1-4.

Applicants note that Species I-XIII are encompassed within the underlying concept of the present invention. In particular, Species I and Species II-XIII all require a portion to be bulged or projected outwardly from an opening of the socket body. Thus, the subject matter of all the claims is sufficiently related so that a thorough search of the subject matter of any one species would encompass a search for the subject matter of the remaining claims. Thus, a search and examination of the non-elected claims would not place a serious burden on the Examiner. M.P.E.P. § 803 states that "[i]f the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits." (Emphasis added.) Applicants respectfully submit that this policy should be applied in the present application to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to the Applicant and duplicative examination by the Patent Office.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the election of species requirement.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 4, 2005

By: Stephen L. Peterson #26,325 for
John M. Romary
Reg. No. 26,331